(word processor parameters LM=1, RM=75, TM=2, BM=2)

Taken from KeelyNet BBS (214) 324-3501
Sponsored by Vangard Sciences
PO BOX 1031
Mesquite, TX 75150

GRAVITY4.ASC
this file courteously shared by Joseph Misiolek
October 21, 1990

CAN GRAVITY be INDUCED?

Observational Evidence and Verifiable Proof for

A Dynamic GRAVAC Sun

by
Stephen Paul Goodfellow

1987

CONTENT:

Introduction	Page 2 & 3
A Solar Shell	3
Proof	4 & 5
Elusive Neutrinos	5 & 6
Sunspots	6
Thought Model	6 & 7
Plasma: The Super-Hot Gas	7 & 8
Rudiments of the dynamic GRAVAC Cycle	8 & 9
Helioseismology - The Ring of Truth	9 & 10
Related Natural Phenomena	10
Mr. Science & the Breezy Room	11
Nature's Gravity Wells	11 & 12

Consequences of a GRAVAC Sun 12 & 13

Conclusion 13 - 16

Credits 16

References 17 & 18

INTRODUCTION

It has long been believed that gravity is the fundamental cause of solar radiation.

The presently popular Hydrogen/Fusion Core theory rests on the assumption that the mutual gravitational attraction of the Sun's individual atoms override all other acting forces, thereby causing the Suns mass to contract. This in turn creates the internal pressures which inaugurate nuclear fusion within the Sun's core.

This scenario appears to be reasonably logical at a glance, but when viewed in the sharp light of observational evidence, it becomes glaringly obvious that the reasoning upon which the Hydrogen/Fusion Core theory rests is unsound and quite erroneous.

Despite the fact that virtually every major solar observation is at odds with this popular solar model, physicists continue to subscribe to it because there does not seem to be a logical alternative.

The wound caused by this dilemma is deep and there for all to see; the ability to control a sustained fusion reaction continues to elude researchers, chiefly because of the alchemic approach with which they attempt to apply their craft.

The reason for this sad state of affairs is simple: Fusion research is so costly that in their eagerness to magnetically cage the fusion reaction, scientists forgo the necessary research needed to understand what goes on in the fusion process.

It is not unlike a blind man attempting to restrain a beast he cannot see; the blind man builds traps and cages without understanding the nature of the beast.

Such an attempt must surely end in failure.

PLASMA is the name of the beast that we must strive to understand; it is a super hot gas of disassociated electrons and protons.

When united within a common magnetic field it is capable of performing incredible configurations.

Its nature is so different from solid, liquid or gas states, that it has been designated a state of matter in its own right: a plasma, the fourth state of matter.

Faced with such an awesome discovery, it would seem reasonable to assume nothing is as we expected it to be. In the light of this newly discovered state of matter, we should proceed as if perceiving the universe for the first time.

NONE of the four known forces in the universe (the Strong, Weak, Electromagnetic and gravitational,) nor their interactions with the known states of matter - may be taken for granted when we know there is a new player on the field.

When the dynamic state of the plasma was realized, solar physicists seem to have been reluctant to consider the Sun anew; the

intermittently arriving new knowledge of plasma states continue to be ignored or hastily incorporated into a solar theory already beset with unreconcilable contradictions, resulting in a hodge-podge of discontinuous conjectures.

The focal point of this current dilemma lies in the fact that our science community suffers from an unshakable faith in the inviolableness of mass/gravity. It is taken for granted that the gravitational force is dependent on the quantity of matter present.

This is an unproven conjecture - an act of faith.

Such an attitude has for too many years confined potentially creative ideas within constrictions which in reality do not exist.

I believe strongly that such unbending dogma does not belong in the quest for truth, because it has no relation to the objective universe.

A SOLAR SHELL

Our Sun is empty; its mass is distributed in a shell about an "Absolute vacuum."

As I shall demonstrate, an Absolute vacuum induces gravity; it is a rift upon which mass/energy space gravitationally implodes.

This implosion continuously heats the Sun's plasma which in turn maintains the Sun's Absolute vacuum. I call this the Gravity/Vacuum Cycle, or the GRAVAC Cycle.

The electromagnetic potential of a given quantity of mass in a plasma state is 1 X 10 to the 40th times stronger(1) than its gravitational potential.

Because of this, the Sun can radiate by the interlocking of an induced gravitational force that is brought about by the electromagnetic force.

This comes about because the Sun's plasma is magnetically polarized, repelling electrons from electrons and protons from protons. By this process the mass of the Sun is magnetically repulsed and flies apart creating an Absolute Vacuum.

In turn, this Absolute Vacuum induces gravity. The induced gravity restrains the Sun's plasma from further outward expansion, and it is the struggle between the inhibiting induced gravity and the repulsive magnetic properties of the plasma which cause the solar shell to radiate.

PROOF

For this solar model to work, it requires that absolutely no mass, nor radiation can travel through an Absolute vacuum.

Therefore, the experimental evidence of this solar model rests on the following proof:

It can be demonstrated that neutrinos cannot pass through the Sun

Small subatomic particles called neutrinos emanate from stars.(2)

To an observer on Earth, each star has its own neutrino fingerprint, which can be determined by the angle of neutrino approach and the different neutrino energy levels that individual stars produce.

Because neutrinos are so small and have no charge, most are able to pass through the Earth without hitting anything.

Astrophysicists believe that a flow of neutrinos would pass through the Sun without the majority of the neutrinos being stopped by collisions.(3)

But is this so?

Imagine that you are observing neutrinos emanating from an energetic star which is about to be eclipsed by the Sun. When the star is eclipsed, present logic would dictate that neutrinos from the eclipsed star would pass through the Sun.

I propose that they will not.

It is my prediction that the neutrino flow from the star will stop at the moment of occultation (when the star passes behind the sun.)

The reason for this is because the Sun's interior is not a ball of mass in conventional space, as it is presently believed;(4) on the contrary, it is an Absolute vacuum through which nothing passes.

Of course, it is not so easy to look for neutrinos passing through the Sun. An actual experiment would be more complicated, but could probably be performed along these lines:

Due to the fact that neutrino collisions are scarce, one has to rely on a record compiled through time in order to get an accurate determination. You will need a computer and as extensive a compilation of recorded data of neutrino collisions as possible.

The greater span of time the records cover, the more accurate the result.

Take the orbit of the Sun (as seen from Earth,) and break it down into 365 windows or 'sectors' on the plane of the ecliptic, one for each day of a year.

The Sun will pass through all 365 sectors in one year, spending 24 hours in each sector.

Design a program for the computer so that it will list all the neutrinos with an angle of approach that comes within the band divided into 365 sectors.

Eliminate all neutrinos from your data that show energy levels consistent with those of our Sun. Now compile the sectors that the Sun was in each day. Compare them to the 364 other sectors that the Sun was not in.

If present theories on stellar physics are correct, then neutrinos from stellar and galactic sources should flow unimpaired through the Sun, and there will be NO DISCERNIBLE QUANTITATIVE DIFFERENCE between the Sun sectors and the 364 other sectors that the Sun was not in. This will not be so.

I predict that the data will exhibit a CONSISTENT DECREASE of interstellar and intergalactic neutrinos within the solar sectors.

ELUSIVE NEUTRINOS

This chapter offers observational evidence which led me to my conclusions.

Problem:

Dr. Raymond Davis of the Brookhaven National Laboratory has been monitoring the emanation of neutrons from the Sun since 1967, and he has demonstrated that the flow of these neutrinos amounts to less than 1/3 of the amount anticipated by the current hydrogen fusion core theories.(5) Why?

Solution:

The deficiency in the neutrino count may be accounted for as follows; neutrinos originate from, or near, the Sun's surface.

Since nothing can travel through the Sun's Absolute vacuum interior, only the neutrinos produced on the side of the Sun facing us reach the Earth.

Those neutrinos originating from the opposite side of the Sun cannot penetrate the Sun's absolute vacuum interior and so escape the Earth based observer.

This is the cause for the lesser neutrino flow observed to be coming from the Sun.

Problem:

When sunspots occur on the Sun's photosphere, the neutrino count drops.

Neutrinos have no charge and so cannot be affected by the magnetic field of sunspots on the Sun's surface.

If neutrinos originate from the Sun's core and travel outwards, then

sunspots on the photospheric surface should have no effect on the neutrinos.

These subatomic particles should pass to the observer unimpeded, yet the neutrino count is diminished during sunspot activity.(6) Why?

Solution:

Neutrinos originate near the Sun's photospheric surface.

Within sunspots there is decreased temperature and luminosity, so there is less likelihood of neutrino production; hence a decrease of neutrinos during sunspot activity.

SUNSPOTS

Problem:

Sunspots are depressions in the Sun's photospheric surface.(7) If the interior of a sunspot is closer to the Sun's supposed core, why does it get cooler and darker and not hotter and brighter in these areas?

Solution:

The Sun has no core. A sunspot depression is darker because it is closer to the Sun's Absolute vacuum interior.

THOUGHT MODEL

If the Sun's mass is only a thin shell of matter, how does one account for its powerful gravitational attraction?

It is time for a thought model.

Imagine the air in front of you. Imagine now that you can apply a force to expel the air away from a given volume. First, you may notice that the most efficient shape to maintain a vacuum is a sphere.

Next, you might observe that the exterior air is attracted to the vacuum -- an attraction which falls away with the square of the distance from the source. This attraction is a feature which exhibits the same characteristics as the force of gravity.

To illustrate this concept, stir a cup of tea or coffee and carefully pour in some milk. Notice how the interior of the vortex

moves faster than the area further out from the vortex.

A vortex has a low pressure interior and high pressure exterior. It behaves in a manner identical to that of the planets orbiting the Sun, in that both phenomena obey Kepler's Second Law of Planetary Motion (8) - which is a notable characteristic of gravity.

Another way you can observe this attraction at work is to hold a vacuum cleaner nozzle up to a source of smoke. The attraction of smoke to the vacuum nozzle will fall off with the square of the distance from the nozzle, just like gravity.

Let us take our thought model into the real universe.

Space - any space - anywhere, contains a measure of mass/energy.

The proof of this is the Background Radiation which pervades our universe.

Even the 'thinnest' space is a veritable soup of radiation, virtual particles and even whole atoms passing through any given volume at phenomenal speeds.(9)

It follows that the laws of pressure that we applied to our thought model should hold true anywhere in the universe; wherever there is pressure, a vacuum will attract.

If an Absolute vacuum were possible, what behavior would we expect of its nature? How would the universe respond to such a phenomenon?

Dictionaries describe a vacuum as: 'A space devoid of matter.' This definition is no longer a sufficient description of a vacuum, since it appears that all space in the Universe contains some measure of mass/energy.

Perhaps a better description would be: 'A Vacuum is a volume devoid of space.'

Such a volume might be quite different from conventional space. Since temperature is a result of mass/energy space, it is reasonable to assume that the temperature of an Absolute Vacuum must be absolute zero.

If time is a consequence of mass/energy space, then an Absolute Vacuum must be without time. An observer within such a field would not be affected by the time frame of exterior space; time would stand still for that observer while the exterior universe raced on.

A magnetic field is a manifestation of mass/energy but it is NOT mass/energy in itself. Because of this it seems reasonable to assume that a magnetic field may exist within an absolute vacuum.

In our thought model we used an imaginary force to maintain a continuous vacuum. Is there any way of demonstrating the existence of this force?

PLASMA: THE SUPER-HOT GAS

As I mentioned in the introduction, it was not long ago, that physics classified matter into only three states: Solid, liquid, and gas.

It was not realized until recently that a gas heated to a very high temperature does not obey the law of gasses; it displays a behavior unique to its own nature and scientists have only recently begun to probe its secrets.(10)

So different is this state from a regular gas, that it has been classified as a fourth state of matter: a plasma.(11)

Because all stars consist of this super-hot gas, it is estimated that over ninety percent of the known universe exists in a plasma state.(12)

Put simply, plasma is a super-hot gas in which electrons are stripped away from protons, placing particles of like polarity in the same camp.

Plasmas which are shot through a plasma gun (a magnetic field,) and into a vacuum tube display well defined structure.

Unfortunately, because of the speed (120 miles per second,) with which the plasma makes its way down the vacuum tube, photos reveal only a glimmering of the complexity that can be contributed to plasma structure.

However, it is known that the plasma structure can evolve into a helix-like flow composed of two separate streams, one consisting of electrons and the other of protons. Furthermore, it has been observed that the structure as a whole maintains a stable shape that can best be described as a cross between a doughnut and a "Slinky" - a toy spring that can 'walk' down a staircase, - turned in on itself.(13)

It is significant that electrons and protons can organize

into separate camps, because like particles of the same charge repel one another.

If it is possible to produce a plasma configuration where the mutual repulsion of particles occur, then it is likely that the volume left in their wake is an Absolute Vacuum.

It strikes me that it would be a fruitful enterprise to monitor some future plasma experiments with a sensitive gravimeter to see if known plasma configurations exhibit inducing gravity characteristics.

RUDIMENTS OF THE DYNAMIC GRAVAC CYCLE

Although it is highly possible that the following scenario is a gross oversimplification, I believe it to be an accurate thumbnail rendition of the Sun's mode of propagation.

I call it the Solar Gravity/Vacuum Cycle, or the Solar GRAVAC cycle:

Imagine a gaseous giant, perhaps a little bigger than Jupiter.

The gravitational sum of its mass causes intense pressure and so generates atomic fusion at its center.

The fusion reaction splits up protons and electrons which are forced into like camps, where they repel one another.

However, the plasma can only travel outwards a finite distance, because it has left an Absolute Vacuum in its wake.

The attraction of mass/energy space towards the Absolute Vacuum causes a gravitational implosion.

The plasma has nowhere to go. It cannot go further inwards, because of the repulsive magnetic field; nor can it expand outwards, due to the gravity holding it back - what's a plasma to do?

To answer this question, try the following: Rub your hands together fast and furious. See how they get hot?

The solar hydrogen shell is under intense pressure at the vacuum boundary and this causes the Sun's radiation. The released energy maintains the plasma because electrons are stripped from protons and so the cycle repeats, thereby maintaining the radiation of the Sun.

The energy needed to maintain a total vacuum of a given volume is equal to the energy radiating from its boundary. In the case of our sun, that is 3.38 X 10 to the 33 ergs/sec.(14)

Let us now review the cycle:

A primordial giant planet - larger than Jupiter - inaugurates standard gravitational compression in the core of proto-sun

...Pressure...Nuclear Fusion.....Plasma.....Electrons

form

Camp/Protons

form

Camp....Magnetic repulsion....Induced Gravitational Attraction...

And then back to

' Pressure.'....

This concept is in harmony with the conservation of angular momentum, in that it accounts for the relatively slow rotation of our Sun.

Jupiter, the fifth planet from the Sun, has by far the greatest portion of angular momentum of the Solar System. If the Sun contracted from a cloud of hydrogen, one would expect the center to rotate the fastest, like a spinning ice skater will rotate faster if she draws her arms into her side.

The GRAVAC scenario suggests that the early proto-Sun's spin was considerable while it was a dense ball of mass, but as it inaugurated nuclear fusion and expanded into a thin shell of plasma, it lost its angular momentum - like the ice skater letting her arms out and slowing down.(15)

HELIOSEISMOLOGY - THE RING OF TRUTH

A whole new science has recently sprung up called Helioseismology.

It has been observed that the Sun vibrates, rather like a bell. It is presently believed that solar resonances are propagated acoustically from the Sun's core.(16) But is this so?

Solar oscillations came as a complete surprise to solar theorists because one does not usually associate structures that get denser towards their center as good candidates for effective oscillators.

Hollow structures, such as bells are good oscillators; so too is a GRAVAC Sun.

We know from studying the powerful magnetic fields that erupt from sunspot depressions that the Sun is capable of propagating interior magnetic fields reaching thousands of gauss.(17)

It is this interior field which causes the Sun's magnetically sensitive outer shell to dance upon the interior magnetic field, like the oscillations produced by an acoustic speaker.

A blind-folded person would be hard pressed to tell whether he is being addressed directly or via a speaker.

The same is true for Helioseismology; the observer is blind to the interior and so the information is interpreted in the light of present concepts of solar theory.

Helioseismologists have discovered a condition in the Sun's shallower layers which is at variance with conventional core models: Through frequency splittings resulting from the Sun's rotation, it is observed that the rotation actually decreases with depth. It is hard for any core theory to come to terms with this lack of angular momentum.(18)

This observation of the Sun suggests an inversion - a sun turned inside out.

RELATED NATURAL PHENOMENA

Vocal cords produce compressional waves (high and low pressures) that travel through the air.

These waves are received by the ear, which converts them into electro-chemical impulses that are distributed to the relevant centers of the brain.(19)

The ear also acts as a mechanism of body balance; the semi-circular canals allow the brain to determine the position of the head in relation to the gravitational attraction of the Earth.

If pressure and gravity were two separate and unrelated forces, would one not expect to find two distinctly separate organs to monitor these phenomena?

A plane flies through the air; its forward motion produces a flow of air above the wing which creates a standing low pressure center.(20)

The plane is sucked into the air, away from the Earth's gravitational field.

Again we observe an interplay between the forces of pressure and gravity.

When a rocket in space fires its engines, the same interplay of forces are at work. The rocket places a high pressure behind itself; in so doing it can be said that a low pressure center exists in front of the rocket, and the rocket moves in that direction.

MR. SCIENCE & THE BREEZY ROOM

I have constructed a very special room. Its design allows for a flow of air through the ceiling and floor of the room. It has no windows and whoever is inside is unable to make any exterior observations.

As with Einstein's famous accelerating rocket,(21) the observer is free to draw conclusions from any phenomena that take place in the room, but he is unaware of the exterior environment.

We now place a fan above the roof of the room which forces air downwards. Air flows through the room and Mr. Science takes note.

The room is now placed on a high tower some distance above the Earth.

Imagine that we now pile an enormous quantity of air above the tower.

Due to the Earths gravitational attraction which causes the atmosphere to 'hug' the planet, the air will flow back towards the Earth and regain its composure.

In doing so, the air will also flow through Mr. Science's room -he takes note.

When asked about the nature of the two experiments, he tells us that he believes them to be identical - a flow of air from top to bottom.

He is unaware that the first experiment was the result of pressure; nor does he know that the second experiment was caused by gravity.

He therefore concludes that the nature of the force that propelled the air through the room was the same in both instances; to Mr. Science, pressure_and_gravity_are_identical!

NATURE'S GRAVITY WELLS

Earlier, I mentioned that a vortex in a stirred cup of coffee mimics the force of gravity. This phenomena is not limited to our cup; it manifests itself throughout nature's domain.

The low pressure eye of a hurricane is a strangely tranquil place in which there is little wind and the blue sky can be seen above, while on all sides the high pressure fury circulates.

Such is the power of the hurricane's eye that the ocean has been observed to rise several feet higher in this center than the ocean level surrounding the eye.(22)

This rise in sea level is caused by the low pressure of the hurricane's eye; the mass of the ocean in the eye is attracted to the relative vacuum.

As with gravity, the attraction to the eye falls off with the square of the distance from its center.

Spiral galaxies mimic the vortex and their shape leaves us with some perplexing questions: If galaxies are gravitationally-bound systems in dynamic equilibrium, they should consist of enough matter to hold themselves together.

Surprisingly, it would appear that there is not enough matter present in galaxies to achieve this, thereby giving rise to the famous 'Missing Mass Problem'.(23)

How does a spiral galaxy obtain the additional gravitational force when it does not have a corresponding quantity of matter? Is it possible that its high energy center is an Absolute Vacuum?

If the GRAVAC scenario proves correct, then it is not an unreasonable speculation that galactic centers of a spiral galaxies are inducing gravity without a corresponding quantity of mass.

THE CONSEQUENCES OF A GRAVAC SUN

The concept of Absolute Vacuums may go some way to explain Olber's Paradox, which states that, if space is infinite, why is the sky not bright with radiative sources?

If space is interrupted with Absolute Vacuums, - and there would be as many of these as there are stars - then any given area of space would in effect be 'shielded' from other quadrants.

If the Sun is merely a shell of mass and so has considerably less

mass than hitherto expected, then it cannot afford to merely drift around living off its limited mass, or it would soon expend its supply of fuel.

This suggests that there must be some mechanism through which the Sun replenishes its dwindling fuel supply.

I would suggest that it does this by orbiting the galaxy, 'feeding' off the clouds and globules that pervade the Milky Way.

The Sun's magnetic and gravitational capacity make for an efficient 'food foraging' mechanism. Both nebulae and Sun travel in the same direction about the galaxy, like cars traveling in the same direction on a highway.

Although the Sun is unlikely to collide with the nebulae on a given trajectory, their mutual gravitational attraction will alter the Sun's course towards the cloud and the Sun will plunge into the nebula's hydrogen-rich interior.

It is estimated that the Sun's magnetic influence reaches well beyond the planets of our solar system. When highly accelerated particles of the solar wind collide with the gas and dust of space, electrons and protons are knocked off from one another, thus making these particles within the Sun's heliosphere magnetically sensitive.

This is somewhat similar to the static cling you get in a drier.

The charged particle follows the magnetic fieldlines to the north or south pole of the Sun, depending on the polarity of the particle.

The Sun's gravitational and magnetic fields are an effective means of sweeping the galactic plane for matter.

We can see this effect on a smaller scale with our own planet when we watch the cascade of particles coming to Earth in the form of the Aurora Borealis.

In the same way the Sun consumes the matter which is necessary for its continued existence.

Our Sun is presently not in a nebula, and so it is not digesting much matter at the moment, but if you look at stars in these nebulae, you will see that they are in a highly energetic state.

I suggest that this is due to the infalling matter which excites

the surface of these suns. Many astronomers believe that the high energy state of suns in nebulae is due to their youth, and they point to the Hurtzsprung-Russell diagram as the proof of this.

The Hurtzsprung-Russell diagram plots stars on a chart in order of their magnitude and temperature, and it is believed that this tells us something about the evolution of stars.

Can we rely on such a diagram for evolutionary information? Consider this little story:

An umpire is standing in a crowded stadium. Upon his nose is an intelligent wart. This wart desires to know the process of evolution of its host, namely the umpire.

In order to aid itself in this quest, the wart observes the other people in the stadium. Although the wart cannot see, it is able to monitor heartbeats and blood pressure of people present.

Armed with this information, the wart constructs a graph upon which it places the rate of hart beat and blood pressure of all the people in the stadium.

The wart now mistakenly believes that by comparing people in this manner, it has acquired a system that displays a sequence of evolution from youth to old age.

In reality, the graph displays no such information; it merely describes the momentary state of excitement of the people in the stadium. The same is true for stars in nebulae. Stars of any age burn hotter and brighter while feeding.

CONCLUSION

In 1979 I stayed in Chicago with a friend who had been kind enough to give me lodging while I was organizing an exhibition of my artwork.

One evening, after a particularly strenuous day I took a long lazy soak in the bath. By chance I grabbed up an astronomy periodical which lay atop a stack of magazines which happened to contain pictures taken by the Voyager spacecraft which had recently passed through the Jovian system. Those images held me transfixed for hours, and the tub water was quite cold when I emerged from its primordial soup.

Eight years later and after considerable reflection I still cannot dissect, much less put into any coherent order of thought, the process that led to the chrysalis which formed in my mind; I can

only offer its fruits.

These writings are an attempt to put the essence of that vision into a semblance of order.

In the process of writing this paper I have come to realize that we live in an outrageously animated universe where nature's ingenuity is law.

Within this cosm, no cohesive entity is allowed existence unless the efficiency of its structure has undergone nature's rigorous trials.

If suns feed through the manipulation of electromagnetism and gravity, it would seem reasonable to assume that they would do so in the most efficient way possible.

Consider natures 'invention' of the strawberry flower. This is an efficient device which allows for pollination and fruit.

Pollination assures reproduction. The fruit which are derived from the pollinated flower are specifically designed for the survival of its offspring.

The seeds that are imbedded on the surface of the strawberry pass unharmed through the animal digestive system. In this way the offspring are deposited in a rich compost, away from the parent plant thereby avoiding competition.

I propose that it is the nature of suns exhibit the same measure of ingenuity.

In space, mass is scarce and suns will have evolved in such a way as to take the greatest advantage of the mass that is available to them.

Mass - from which gravity and electromagnetism are derived - are the tools with which suns seek their fuel. If suns can induce gravity - make more gravity than the corresponding quantity of mass allows - then they will have sought a way to do so, for it is the nature of all life-forms to seek an excellence of efficiency.

The life-urge is a universal and little-understood force; it is the common thread which holds the microcosm to the macrocosm.

I think it unlikely that this thin sheath we call a biosphere is unique in its essence; if we only choose to see, then manifestations of life are to be found on all scales of the cosm.

Seasons repeat, galaxies spin, atoms oscillate.

Mankind is often fooled into thinking of consistency as inanimate; a cup seems to be a cup from moment to moment, but why should it be the same cup? Is there any particular reason why we should believe

an atom is the same atom after each oscillation?

Can we maintain that a forest is the same forest from season to season?

Nor is the consistency of an ocean's color a result of the inanimate; on the contrary, its color is a celebration of life.

The 'unchanging' appearance of an oceans color and hue is net result of the countless micro-organisms in the process of living within its water.

Why is it so hard for us as humans to see and comprehend a living universe?

In our shells of being, we are trapped in our own time notion and it is only through insight, patience and study that the actions of smaller and larger cosms come to life for us.

Humankind must resist falling prey to the vanity of uniqueness.

The sum of our species has shown no more self determination than any other species; we mindlessly extract trapped carbon in the form of coal and oil and eject it into the Earths atmosphere.

Is there purpose in this?

How would we know if we refuse to even consider the Earth as a living entity of which we are an interacting part? We hurtle along, blinded by our lack of humility; if we refuse look about us in the midst of a living universe, how will we know oblivion even if we were rushing directly towards it?

I suspect that the vast majority of copies of this paper will be thrown away without even being read. Some will be casually browsed through before they are discarded. However, through the sheer force of their numbers it is quite possible that a few - such as you dear reader - will actually have read the paper in its entirety.

I fancy someday, someone will be tempted to perform the occultation experiment which I have described earlier in this paper. I suspect that this will happen sooner or later anyway, and If my vision is false, and neutrinos pass through the Sun unimpeded, then surely I have hurt or offended no one.

However, if it holds the seeds of truth - that gravity is no slave to matter - where lie the limits of humankind's destiny, if we learn to understand and control the nature of its force?

It is quite possible that no one will remember my prediction when verified, but that is of no consequence. The origin of an idea is of no importance; time bleaches the pages of history, names are eventually forgotten in the haze of time and no one is remembered for very long.

I suspect Nietzsche is wrong when he writes that the only things remembered are written in blood and stone. Overall, humankinds collective memory is quite short and so it is only the concepts

that become indispensable and fundamental to the survival of our species that ever remain through the rise and fall of cultures and in my conceit, it is here that I stake my claim.

Man has no time but that river of dreams upon which he casts himself adrift.

If you have any questions or comments, please direct them to me at:

Stephen Goodfellow,
146 Farrand Park,
Highland Park, MI 48023
(313) 883-4827

CREDITS

I would like to thank the following people who have taken the time to correspond or talk with me.

Walter Kauppila, Physics Professor at Wayne State University. Dr. Favro, W.S.U. Professor Chen, Professor of astronomy, W.S.U. Professor Teske, Physics, University of Michigan.

Jim Thele, Electrical Technician at G.M. Greg Menovick, Mathematics, W.S.U. Professor Wadehra, University of Michigan.

Professor Cowley, Physics & Astronomy, Wayne State University. Greenberg, Editor of Kronos Journal. Leslie Leifer, Chemistry, Mich. Tech, Univ. Special thanks to Dr. Raymond Davis of Brookhaven National Laboratory for his research.

Thanks to my Brother, Justin Meilgaard, for helping me with

this pamphlet.

I also thank Bill Haus, Allan Franklin, Ralph Franklin, Janis Lewitt, Dennis Lamberis, Jackie Jablonski, for teaching me how to think.

Special thanks to Lowell Boileau and Marvin Reili to whom I owe the existence of this paper, and who have taken the brunt of my 'off the wall' ideas with immeasurable patience.

REFERENCES

(1) "Gravity" by George Gamow, Doubleday Publishers 1962, p.138

(2) "Realm of the Universe" by George O. Abell, Saunders Pub. 1980. pp.285-86

(3) The concept of neutrinos passing through the Sun is confirmed by conversation with Professor Wadehra from University of Michigan, dept. of Astrophysics (1/21/85) Prof. Wadehra also agreed that it is hypothetically possible to determine:

(a) The source of a neutrino; the angle of neutrino approach can be determined by collision, and

(b) A neutrino's energy level can be determined. (Hence a solar neutrino cannot be mistaken for a neutrino of a higher energy even though it originates from a star which is occulted by the Sun.)

(4) See "Sun," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1980, vol.17, p.178.

(5) Encyclopedia Britannica, "Science and the Future" Year Book, 1983; 'The phantom Neutrino' by James S. Trefil, p.224

(6) News Notes, Sky & Telescope December issue, 1984 p.506

(7) "Sunspots" 1979 by R. J. Bray and R. E. Loughhead. Dover Publications,p.4.

(8) "Sensitive Chaos" by Theodor Schwenk, Schocken Books, New York, 1978 ; pp.44-45.

(9) "The Key to the Universe" 1978 by Nigel Calder. Penguin Pub. New York, p.26.

"Astrophysical Quantities" 1973 by C.W. Allen, 3rd ed. The Athlone Press, Univ. of London; p.265.

(10) "Solid Clues" 1985 by Gerald Feinburg, Simon & Schuster pub. p.23

(11) "The ABC of Plasma" Fusion Magazine, by Riemannian, Nov. 1978

(12) "Dictionary of Science" 1986 Barnhart Books, p.502

(13) "The ABC of Plasma" Fusion Magazine, by Riemannian, Nov.1978p.42.

(14) "Realm of the Universe"1980 by George O. Abell, Saunders Publication p.222

(15) "Design of the Universe" by Fritz Kahn, Klein Publishers, New York 1954 pp. 207-208.

(16) Scientific American, Sept. 1985 "Helioseismology" (Article,) John W. Leibacher, Robers W. Noyes, Juri Toomre, Roger K. Ulrich; p.48-57.

(17) "A New Sun" by John A. Eddy, NASA 1979 (SP-402); p.27.

(18) See (15); p.56.

(19) Encyclopedia Britannica 1980 vol.5, 'Ear,'pp. 1120-1131. Also: "The Body" 1985 Anthony Smith, Pelican Books, 'The Ear.'

(20) Encyclopedia Britannica 1980 vol.1, 'Heavier-than-air craft,' pp.372-383

(21) "Gravity" by George Gamow, Doubleday Publishers 1962, p.118

(22) Encyclopedia Britannica 1980 vol. 9, 'Hurricanes and Typhoons' p.63

Scientific American 1964 vol.211, 'Experiments in Hurricane Modification' by R.H. Simpson and Joanne S. Malkus, pp.27-37

(23) "Principles of Cosmology" 1978, by Michael Berry, Cambridge Univ. Press, London; p.17.

If you have comments or other information relating to such topics as this paper covers, please upload to KeelyNet or send to the Vangard Sciences address as previously listed.

Thank you for your consideration, interest and support.

Jerry W. Decker.....Ron Barker.....Chuck Henderson
Vangard Sciences/KeelyNet

If we can be of service, you may contact
Jerry at (214) 324-8741 or Ron at (214) 242-9346